

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

I. NOTICE: The following solicitation provisions pertinent to this section are hereby incorporated by reference:

A. FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION SOLICITATION PROVISIONS

52.204-06 DATA UNIVERSAL NUMBERING SYSTEM (DUNS) NUMBER (APR 1998)
52.204-07 Central Contractor Registration (Oct 2003)
52.211-14 NOTICE OF PRIORITY RATING FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE USE (SEP 1990) Rated Order: 'DOC3'
52.214-34 SUBMISSION OF OFFERS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE (APR 1991)
52.215-01 INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS--COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION (Jan 2004)
52.216-01 TYPE OF CONTRACT: Fixed Price Award Fee with some Cost Reimbursement CLINs' (APR 1984)
52.222-24 PREAWARD ON-SITE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY COMPLIANCE EVALUATION (FEB 1999)
52.233-02 SERVICE OF PROTEST (AUG 1996)
Para (a) Carolle Henderson-Gilbert, Contracting Officer, 1801 Tenth (10th) Street WPAFB, OH 45433-7626
52.237-01 SITE VISIT (APR 1984)
52.252-01 SOLICITATION PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (FEB 1998)

B. DEFENSE FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION SUPPLEMENT SOLICITATION PROVISIONS

252.204-7001 COMMERCIAL AND GOVERNMENT ENTITY (CAGE) CODE REPORTING (DEC 1991)
252.227-7028 TECHNICAL DATA OR COMPUTER SOFTWARE PREVIOUSLY DELIVERED TO THE GOVERNMENT (JUN 1995)

C. AIR FORCE FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION SUPPLEMENT SOLICITATION PROVISIONS

5352.215-9000 FACILITY CLEARANCE (May 1996)

D. AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND FAR SOLICITATION PROVISIONS

5352.209-9003 POTENTIAL ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST (AFMC) (JUL 1997)
Para (a), nature of the proposed conflict is
Para (a) (1) nature of the proposed restraint and the applicable time period is

5352.215-9006 INTENT TO INCORPORATE CONTRACTOR'S TECHNICAL PROPOSAL (AFMC) (Aug 1998)

5352.245-9005 ELIMINATION OF COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE IN THE USE OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY (AFMC) (JUL 1997)

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

II. NOTICE: The following solicitation provisions pertinent to this section are hereby incorporated by full text:

A. FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION SOLICITATION PROVISIONS IN FULL TEXT

52.252-01 SOLICITATION PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (FEB 1998)

This solicitation incorporates one or more solicitation provisions by reference, with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request, the Contracting Officer will make their full text available. The offeror is cautioned that the listed provisions may include blocks that must be completed by the offeror and submitted with its quotation or offer. In lieu of submitting the full text of those provisions, the offeror may identify the provision by paragraph identifier and provide the appropriate information with its quotation or offer. Also, the full text of a solicitation provision may be accessed electronically at this/these address(es):

<http://farsite.hill.af.mil/>

B. AIR FORCE FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION SUPPLEMENT SOLICITATION PROVISIONS IN FULL TEXT

5352.215-9001 NOTICE OF PRE-BID/PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE (MAY 1996)- ALTERNATE I (MAY 1996)

(a) An (Industry Day) pre-bid/pre-proposal conference was conducted at ASC/Det 1 2503 East Avenue P, Palmdale CA 93550-2196 on 22-23 Jun 04 for the purpose of presenting questions and answers in regards to the planned Air Force Plant 42 requirement.

(b) A record of the conference was made and furnished to all prospective bidders/offerors via PIXS.

C OTHER SOLICITATION PROVISIONS IN FULL TEXT

L001 APPLICABLE CLAUSES (OCT 2004)

The appropriate clauses to be included in the contract will be determined based on the Offeror's response to the Section K representations.

(a) Patent Rights. If the Offeror is a small business firm or nonprofit organization, then FAR 52.227-11, PATENT RIGHTS-RETENTION BY THE CONTRACTOR (SHORT FORM), DFARS 252.227-7034, PATENTS - SUBCONTRACTS, and DFARS 252.227-7039, PATENTS - REPORTING OF SUBJECT INVENTIONS will be used in Section I. Otherwise, FAR 52.227-12, PATENT RIGHTS - RETENTION BY THE CONTRACTOR (LONG FORM), will be included in Section I consistent with FAR Part 27.

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

(b) Cost Accounting Standards. Section I of this solicitation may contain the three Cost Accounting Standards clauses at FAR 52.230-3, 52.230-4, 52.230-5, and/or 52.230-6. The resultant contract will contain only those clauses required based on the Offeror's response to the Section K certification titled Cost Accounting Standards Notices and Certification (National Defense).

(c) State of New Mexico. Section I of this solicitation may contain the clause at FAR 52.229-10, STATE OF NEW MEXICO GROSS RECEIPTS AND COMPENSATING TAX. The resultant contract will contain this clause only if performance is in whole or in part within the State of New Mexico and the contract directs or authorizes the contractor to acquire property as a direct cost under the contract.

L002 SOLICITATION EXCEPTIONS (FEB 1997)

Should the offeror not concur with the proposed contract schedule and provisions, or desired modification thereto, it should be so stated in the proposal transmittal letter with reasons therefore.

L003 RFP TECHNICAL CLARIFICATIONS (FEB 1997)

Offerors who determine that the technical requirements of this RFP require clarification(s) in order to permit submittal of a responsive proposal shall submit all questions in writing within 10 days of receipt of the RFP. These questions shall be directed to the Contract Negotiator identified on the cover page of the solicitation.

L004 DETERMINATION OF COMPETITIVE RANGE (FEB 1997)

(a) Pursuant to FAR 15.306, the Contracting Officer's determination of competitive range of proposals submitted as a result of this solicitation will consider such criteria as technical evaluation/ranking of the proposal, initial cost/ price proposed, and other items set forth in Section M of this solicitation. See the Section M paragraph entitled "Evaluation Criteria," for a definitive listing of these criteria and their relative importance.

(b) Offerors are hereby advised that only those proposals determined to have a reasonable chance for award of a contract will be included in the competitive range. While every effort will be made to maintain strong competition, the Contracting Officer will also look to eliminate time consuming and unnecessary discussions with those offerors whose proposals have no reasonable chance for award. This procedure is considered beneficial to both the Air Force and the offerors involved since, in addition to saving further expenditure of resources, acquisition lead-time should be reduced.

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

(c) Accordingly, offerors should submit initial proposals on their most favorable terms, from both a technical and cost/price standpoint. Again, it should be noted that proposals will not be included in the competitive range solely on the basis of technical acceptability, nor will they be included due to cost/price considerations alone.

(d) Offerors, whose proposals are not included in the competitive range, will be notified promptly by the Contracting Officer (CO). Additional information relative to such proposals will be provided through debriefing of unsuccessful offerors if requested. Offerors desiring debriefing must make their request IAW the requirements of FAR 15.505 or 15.506, as applicable.

L005 ACCESS TO AIR FORCE COMPUTER SYSTEMS (MAR 1999)

If performance under this contract will require access to Air Force computer systems (stand alone or networked), compliance with Air Force Instruction (AFI) 33-119 and Air Force Systems Security Instruction (AFSSI) 5027 is mandatory. It should be noted that such access requires, at a minimum, a National Agency Check or Entrance National Agency Check in accordance with DoD 5200.2-R, Personal Security Program. Offerors should make themselves familiar with local procedures for processing such requirements, and be prepared to be in compliance on the first day of contract performance. Failure to comply with this requirement may be considered a failure to perform.

L006 SUBMISSION OF COST OR PRICING DATA (FEB 2003)

(a) It is anticipated that pricing of this action will be based on adequate price competition; therefore, offerors are not required to submit certified cost or pricing data. However, if after receipt of proposals it is determined that adequate price competition does not exist, cost or pricing data (see FAR 15.406-2, Certificate of Current Cost or Pricing Data) shall be required.

(b) If it is determined that adequate price competition does not exist, the offeror shall provide current, complete and accurate cost or pricing data within 30 calendar days after receipt of the Contracting Officer's request.

SECTION LII RFP PECULIAR INSTRUCTIONS (OCT 1998)

III. NOTICE: The following additional provisions are pertinent to this section:

1.0. REVISIONS

All clauses and provisions cited are current. Any regulation change(s) occurring after writing of the solicitation may not affect the terms and conditions of the contract unless such changes are (1) required by Statute, Executive Order, special direction of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) or supplements thereto or (2) considered necessary.

2.0. COMPLIANCE WITH THE SOLICITATION

The offeror shall comply to the maximum extent with the intent of this RFP in supplying information that is current, timely, and in full support of the proposal. RFP exceptions or deviations must be fully documented and explained.

3.0. FINAL PROPOSAL REVISION PROCEDURES

It is anticipated contract award will be made without conducting discussions; however, this decision cannot be rendered prior to review of the submitted proposals. The contracting officer may request or allow proposal revisions to clarify and document understandings reached during negotiations. If an offerors' proposal is eliminated or otherwise removed from the competitive range, no further revisions to the offerors' proposal shall be accepted or considered. At the conclusion of discussions, each offeror still in the competitive range shall be given the opportunity to submit a final proposal revision. Should discussions be conducted the following procedures shall apply.

(a) Page limits for evaluation notices will be identified by the Government at the time of issuance.

(b) The solicitation contains a model contract. During the written period, but before the Government requests a final proposal revision, revisions to the model contract are to be fully agreed upon by the offeror and the Government. The Government will update, print and provide the revised documents to the appropriate offeror for final review prior to the final proposal revision period for Government authored documents. Those documents authored by the offeror, will be typed and printed by the offeror, and submitted to the Government for review prior to the final proposal revision period.

(c) Upon the Government's final proposal revision request, the offeror shall insert costs/prices and execute the revised contract previously agreed upon as part of the submission. Any change to the contract other than price at the time of final proposal submission may result in the offeror being excluded from award consideration.

(d) Offeror(s) will be given a common cut-off date for receipt of final proposal revisions. Offeror(s) will be given no more than 7 calendar days to submit their final proposal revision.

SECTION LIII INFORMATION TO OFFERORS (ITO) (OCT 1998)

List of Attachments to Section L

Attachment 1 – Cross Reference Matrix
Attachment 2 – Past Performance “Facts Sheet”
Attachment 3 – Past Performance Questionnaire
Attachment 4 – Past Performance Questionnaire Transmittal Letter
Attachment 5- Past Performance Client Authorization Letter
Attachment 6 - Past Performance Questionnaire Tracking Record
Attachment 7- Fire Exercise # 1
Attachment 8 – Fire Exercise # 2
Attachment 9 - Security Exercise

1.0 Program Objective, Approach, and funding

1.1 Objective

AFP 42 is managed by Aeronautical Systems Center (ASC), Facilities Support Branch (ASC/ENVP), Acquisition Environmental, Safety and Health Division, Engineering Directorate. The contracting activity conducting the source selection is ASC/ENVK, Wright-Patterson AFB OH 45433-7626. ASC Detachment 1 at Palmdale CA will administer the contract. AFP 42 is comprised of several different government-owned, contractor-operated (GOCO) industrial sites with various site operators responsible for operation of one or more sites. The purpose of the O&M contract is to support the ASC Detachment 1 mission which is: "To provide command and control of AFP 42 for production, modification, depot maintenance, and flight-test of US Aerospace Systems and to support government and commercial joint-use airfield operations." An adequate level of O&M services is required to protect and support ongoing aircraft maintenance and planned production and testing of aircraft at AFP 42.

1.2 Approach

The Government intends on awarding a Fixed Price Award Fee (with some Cost Reimbursement CLINs) contract with one base year and four one year options. The Government will select the best overall offer, based upon an integrated assessment of Mission Capability, Proposal Risk, Past Performance, and Cost/Price. This is a best value source selection conducted in accordance with the current Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement AFFARS Mandatory Procedures (MP) 5315.3 Source Selection.

1.3 Funding/Rough Order Of Magnitude (ROM)

For consideration in developing your proposal, the following ROM is provided:

ROM ESTIMATE PROFILE

Calendar year and Estimated Amount:

2005	\$ 4,000,000
2006	\$16,800,000
2007	\$17,700,000
2008	\$18,600,000
2009	\$19,600,000
2010	\$15,500,000

2.0 General Instructions

This section provides general guidance for preparing proposals as well as specific instructions on the format and content of the proposal. The offeror's proposal must include all data and information requested by this section and must be submitted IAW these instructions. The offer shall be compliant with the requirements as stated in the **Performance Work Statement, (PWS)**, Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL), and Model Contract. **Non-conformance with these instructions may result in an unfavorable proposal evaluation.**

The proposal shall be clear, concise, and shall include sufficient detail for effective evaluation and for substantiating the validity of stated claims. The proposal should not simply rephrase or restate the Government's requirements, but rather shall provide convincing rationale to address how the offeror intends to meet these requirements. Offerors shall assume that the Government has no prior knowledge of their capabilities and experience, and will base its evaluation on the information presented in the offeror's proposal.

Elaborate brochures or documentation, binding, detailed artwork, or other embellishments are unnecessary and are not desired.

The proposal acceptance period is specified in Section A of the model contract/solicitation. The offeror shall make a clear statement in Section A of the proposal documentation volume that the proposal is valid until this date.

IAW FAR Subpart 4.8 (Government Contract Files), the Government will retain one copy of all unsuccessful proposals. Unless the offeror requests otherwise, the Government will destroy extra copies of unsuccessful proposals.

2.1 General Information

2.1.1 Point of Contact

The Contracting Officer (CO), Carolle Henderson-Gilbert, (937) 255-1959, e-mail Carolle.Henderson-Gilbert@wpafb.af.mil and Contract Negotiator/Buyer, Rosalyn Jones (937) 255-2808, e-mail Rosalyn.Jones@wpafb.af.mil are the **exclusive** points of contact for this acquisition. Written questions or requests for clarification may be sent to these individuals at the address located in Section A of the model contract/solicitation or via e-mail. It is encouraged that any such questions or requests be submitted within ten (10) days of the RFP release date. Answers to such questions and clarifications will be provided via posting questions and answers (Q&A) on ASC's Pre-Award Information eXchange System (PIXS) and/or a RFP amendment. In the event of conflict between the answer to questions and the RFP, the RFP shall take precedence.

2.1.2 Debriefings

The CO will promptly notify offerors of any decision to exclude them from the competitive range, where upon they may request and receive a debriefing IAW FAR 15.505. The CO will notify unsuccessful offerors in the competitive range of the source selection decision IAW FAR 15.506. Upon such notification, unsuccessful offerors may request and receive a debriefing. Offerors desiring debriefing must make their request IAW the requirements of FAR 15.505 or 15.506, as applicable.

2.1.3 Discrepancies

If an offeror believes that the requirements in these instructions contain an error, omission, or are otherwise unsound, the offeror shall immediately notify the CO in writing with supporting rationale. The offeror is reminded that the Government reserves the right to award this effort based on the initial proposal, as received, without discussion.

2.1.4 Reference Library

Reference Library - A reference library has been established containing all solicitation documents on the Pre-Award Information Exchange System (PIXS), ASC's electronic bulleting board. This library is located at <http://www.pixs.wpafb.af.mil/>. Any items not available may be obtained through ASC/Det 1, Kathleen Cook, at (661)272-6709 or fax (661)272-7558.

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

2.1.5 Proposal Submission

The offeror's proposal shall be prepared and submitted in five volumes: Mission Capability (Volume I), Past Performance (Volume II), Cost/Price (Volume III), Model Contract (Volume IV), and Contract Attachments (Volume V). All volumes must be received via two different media, electronic (CD-ROM) and paper. Proposals shall be sent to the Contracting Officer at the address below:

ASC/AE, Bldg. 570, Room 113
ATTN: Ms Carolle Henderson-Gilbert (Air Force Plant 42)
1175 Eleventh Street
Wright-Patterson AFB OH 45433-7404

Each volume will be labeled with a cover page containing (at a minimum) the program reference, volume title, and submission date.

2.1.5.1 Deadlines

Two deadlines are established for submission of AFP 42 proposals. The Past Performance (Volume II) part of the proposal must be received by 1:00PM EST on 12 Jan 05. The Mission Capability (Volume I), Cost/Price (Volume III), Model Contract, and Contract Attachments (Volumes IV and V) must be received by 1:00PM EST on 27 Jan 05.

2.1.5.2 Organization, Number of Copies, and Page Limits

The offeror shall prepare the proposal as set forth in the Proposal Organization Table (Table 2.1 below). The titles of the volumes shall be as defined in this table, all of which shall be within the required page limits. The contents of each proposal volume are described in the Section L paragraph as noted in the table below.

Table 2.1 Proposal Organization

VOLUME	Section L Paragraph Number	TITLE	COPIES (Paper/Electronic)	PAGE LIMIT
I	3	Mission Capability/Proposal Risk (SEE NOTE A BELOW)	3/1	93 to be Comprised of items I(a)-I(e)
I(a)	3	Management	3/1	40 (Maximum)
I(b)	3	Resource/Physical Security	3/1	15 (Maximum)
I(c)	3	Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting	3/1	20 (Maximum)
I(d)	3	Maintenance/Airfield Maint.	3/1	15 (Maximum)

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

I(e)	3	Engineering Services	3/1	3 (Maximum)
II	4	Past Performance (SEE NOTE B BELOW)	3/1	40 (Maximum)
III	5	Cost/Price	3/1	unlimited
IV	6	Model Contract (Sections A-K)	3/1	unlimited
V	7	Contract Attachments	3/1	unlimited

Note A: The total maximum page submittal count for Mission Capability Volume I is 68, which is comprised of Volume I sub items (I (a)-(e)). Each sub item has its own maximum page limitation: I(a) Management (20 pages), I(b) Resource/Physical Security (15 pages), I(c) Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting (20 pages), I(d) Maintenance (10 pages), and I(e) Engineering Services (3 pages).

Note B: The contracts cited must have been active within the last three years. Maximum page count is 40 (4 pages for each relevant contract, 2 pages for each key subcontract), including Volume introduction and Facts Sheet for each relevant contract. Questionnaire transmittal letters, Client authorization letters, and the Past Performance Questionnaire Tracking Record sheets are not included in the page count for the Past Performance Volume.

2.1.5.3 Paper Version

One of the three paper copies of the proposal shall be the original signed copy and will become the official contract's copy. Each Volume of the proposal shall be contained in a separate three-ring loose leaf binder which permits the Volume to lie flat when open. Staples shall not be used. A cover sheet should be contained in each book, clearly marked as to volume number, title, copy number, solicitation identification, and the offeror's name. The same identifying data should be placed on the spine of each binder. All appropriate markings including those prescribed IAW FAR 52.215-1(e), Restriction on Disclosure and Use of Data, and 3.104-5, Disclosure, Protection, and Marking of Contractor Bid or Proposal Information, Source Selection Information, and classification will be applied.

2.1.5.4 Electronic Version

1. For submitting electronic versions of your proposal, offerors shall follow these instructions:

- a. Electronic storage media shall be submitted in one of the following formats: prerecorded (pressed) CD-ROM, CD-R, CD-RW, or CD-R/RW.
- b. If you submit documents using Microsoft Office 2000 (or an earlier version), save files in default format; e.g. with Word, "Save as type" set to "Word Document (*.doc)" only.
- c. If you submit documents using Microsoft Word XP (2002) or 2003:

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

1. For Word XP (2002) documents, set "Save as type" to Word 97-2002 & 6.0/95 - RTF (*.doc).
2. For Word 2003 documents, set "Save as type" to Word 97-2003 & 6.0/95 - RTF (*.doc).
3. Under the Word File menu do not use Versions...

d. When using Microsoft Excel XP (2002) or 2003:

1. For Excel XP (2002) spreadsheets, set "Save as type" to "Microsoft Excel 97-2002 & 5.0/95 Workbook (*.xls)".
2. For Excel 2003 spreadsheets, set "Save as type" to "Microsoft Excel 97-2003 & 5.0/95 Workbook (*.xls)".

e. When using Microsoft PowerPoint XP (2002) or 2003:

1. For PowerPoint XP (2002) presentations, set "Save as type" to "Microsoft PowerPoint 97-2002 & 95 Presentation (*.ppt)".
2. For PowerPoint 2003 presentations, set "Save as type" to "Microsoft PowerPoint 97-2003 & 95 Presentation (*.ppt)".

f. Submit any Microsoft Project files in Microsoft Project 98 or later. There are no special "save" functions required for later versions of Project.

g. Submit PDF documents using only Adobe Acrobat 5.0. Do NOT submit any documents in PDF format that are copied as "images". When creating PDF files always create to enable textual search and copy functions. Also, do not scan text pages into proposals.

h. Limit individual file sizes to 10MB or less.

i. Notify the government of the software used to develop the proposal. The computers being used to evaluate the proposals have Microsoft Office 97 and Project 2000 installed. Indicate on each CD-ROM the volume number and title. Each volume shall be in separate directories on the CD-ROM. Use separate files to permit rapid location of all portions, including exhibits, annexes, addenda and attachments, if any. If files are compressed, the necessary decompression program must be included. Multiple disks, if required, will each be labeled with the contents. The file-naming convention for the proposal volumes is as follows:

Files

File Name

Volume I

Mission Capability/
Proposal Risk

Mission Capability
Proposal Risk

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Volume II		
Present and Past Performance	Past performance	
Volume III		
Cost/Price	Cost price	
Volume IV		
Model Contract (A – K)	Model contract	
Volume V		
Contract Attachments	Descriptive identify w/file name	

2.1.5.5 Page Limitations

Page limitations shall be treated as maximums. If exceeded, the excess pages will not be read or considered in the evaluation of the proposal and (for the paper copy) will be returned to the offeror as soon as practical. Page limitations shall be placed on responses to Evaluation Notices (EN's). The specified page limits for EN responses will be identified in the letters forwarding the ENs to the offerors. When both sides of a sheet display printed material (paper copy), it shall be counted as 2 pages. Each page shall be counted against the limit except the following: Cover pages/letters, tables of contents, tabs, or glossaries (data contained on these exempted pages will not be evaluated). Other exemptions are specified in the relevant paragraphs.

2.1.5.6 Page Size and Format

Page size shall be 8.5 x 11 inches, not including foldouts. Pages shall use 1.5-line spacing. Except for the reproduced sections of the solicitation document, the text size shall be no less than 12 point. Tracking, kerning, and leading values shall not be changed from the default values of the word processing or page layout software. Use at least 1-inch margins on the top and bottom and 3/4 inch side margins. Pages shall be numbered sequentially by volume. These page format restrictions shall apply to responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs). Legible tables, charts, graphs and figures shall be used wherever practical to depict information. These displays shall be uncomplicated, legible and shall not exceed 11 by 17 inches in size. Foldout pages shall fold entirely within the volume, and count as a single page. Foldout pages may only be used for large tables, charts, graphs, diagrams and schematics and not for pages of text. For tables, charts, graphs and figures, the text shall be no smaller than 8 point. Transmittal letters will not be considered in the overall page count nor will they be evaluated. These limitations shall apply to both electronic and paper copy proposals.

2.1.5.7 Cost or Pricing Information

All cost or pricing information shall be addressed ONLY in the Cost/Price Volume III and the Model Contract Volume IV. Offeror's shall provide a narrative on the cost/price proposal, including the fixed price portion. This narrative shall be placed in front portion of the Cost/Price Volume III.

2.1.5.8 Cross Referencing

To the greatest extent possible, each volume shall be written on a stand-alone basis so that its contents may be evaluated with a minimum of cross-referencing to other volumes of the proposal. Information cross-referenced and required for proposal evaluation, which is not found in its designated volume will be assumed to have been omitted from the proposal. Cross-referencing within a proposal volume is permitted where its use would conserve space without impairing clarity. The offeror shall provide a proposal cross-reference matrix, which correlates the RFP with the offeror's proposal. The cross-reference matrix will reference the Proposal, PWS, CLIN, Section L, Section M, CDRL, and Model Contract and will not be included in the volume page count. A Cross Reference Matrix **example** is shown in Attachment 1.

2.1.5.9 Indexing

Each volume shall contain a more detailed table of contents to delineate the subparagraphs within that volume. Tab indexing shall be used to identify sections and do not count against the page limitations for their respective volumes.

2.1.5.10 Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms

Each volume shall contain a glossary of all abbreviations and acronyms used, with an explanation for each. Glossaries do not count against the page limitations for their respective volumes.

3.0 VOLUME I MISSION CAPABILITY AND PROPOSAL RISK

3.1 General - The Mission Capability Volume should be specific and complete. Legibility, clarity, brevity and coherence are very important. Your proposal will be evaluated against the Mission Capability sub-factors and Proposal Risk factor as defined in Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award. All the requirements specified in the solicitation are mandatory. By your proposal submission, you are representing that your firm will perform all the requirements specified in the solicitation. It is not necessary or desirable for you to tell us so in your proposal. Do not merely reiterate the objectives or reformulate the requirements specified in the solicitation..

3.2 Formats and Specific Count

3.2.1 Mission Capability and Proposal Risk

Mission Capability and Proposal Risk shall be addressed in the Mission Capability/Proposal Risk volume. The basic volume is limited to 93 pages (see Table 2.1 for specifics). In this volume, address your proposed approach to meeting the requirements of each Mission Capability sub-factor, as well as the risks in your proposed approach in terms of mission capability/performance, cost, and/or schedule.

Address Proposal Risk by identifying those aspects of the proposal that you consider to involve cost and/or mission capability sub-factor risk(s) and classify each IAW (AFFARS) MP 5315.305, paragraph 5.5.2 Provide the rationale for each risk and it's rating, including quantitative estimates of the impact on cost, schedule, and performance. Describe the impact of each identified risk in terms of its potential to interfere with or prevent the successful accomplishment of other contract requirements (e.g., PWS or CDRL), whether or not those requirements are identified as sub-factors. Suggest realistic "work-arounds" or risk mitigators for identified risks that will eliminate or reduce risks to an acceptable level. Identify and classify any new risks introduced by such risk mitigation.

3.2.2 Volume I Organization

The Mission Capability/Proposal Risk volume shall be organized according to the following general outline:

- Table of Contents
- List of Table and Drawings
- Glossary
- Cross Reference Matrix
- Factor 1
 - Sub-factor 1- Management
 - Sub-factor 2- Security Forces Protection
 - Sub-factor 3- Security Forces Exercise
 - Sub-factor 4- Fire Fighting
 - Sub-factor 5- ARFF exercise #1
 - Sub-factor 6- ARFF exercise #2
 - Sub-factor 7- Maintenance
 - Sub-factor 8- Airfield Maintenance
 - Sub-factor 9- Engineering Services
- Factor 2
- Risk
- Risk Matrix (if needed)

3.2.3 Specific Content by Evaluation Factor

The Mission Capability/Proposal Risk Volume shall describe how the offeror intends to satisfy the requirements of each sub-factor and address the risks associated with each.

3.3 Factor 1 Mission Capability

3.3.1 Sub-factor 1 – Management

The offeror shall present their management approach to the AFP 42 O&M contract as identified in the attached PWS. The offeror shall propose management processes, including Integration Management, Scope Management, Time & Cost Management, Quality Management, Human Resource Management, Communications Management, Fleet maintenance and management, Transition Plan, Safety, Information Technology (IT), Government Furnished Property (GFP), and Risk Management. The offeror shall also include subcontractors/subcontracts and interfaces with Government Integrated Product Teams.

3.3.2 Sub-factor 2-Security Forces Protection

The offeror shall present their approach to providing law enforcement and priority resource protection as it relates to an Air Force Industrial Facility. The offeror shall present their Security Force Protection approach as it relates to entry control points, roving patrols, emergency response to incidents on the airfield, priority resource protection, experience with anti-terrorism responses, surge staffing in response to Force Protection Condition changes, and training and certification plans required for this contract.

3.3.3 Sub-factor 3- Security Forces Exercise

The offeror shall present their response to the Security Forces Exercise in a format that clearly describes all steps taken from the onset of the exercise scenario, to the final resolution of the situation. The offeror shall include but not limited to force configuration, method of force deployment, and steps/checklists utilized, and how the situation was resolved. (see attachment 9 of section L, Security Exercise)

3.3.4 Sub-factor 4- Fire Fighting

The offeror shall present their approach to providing Structural and Aircraft fire fighting services as they relate to Air Force Industrial Facilities and Airfield Operations. The offeror shall present their fire protection approach relating to equipment utilization and manning, overall staffing, training and certification programs, fire prevention services, hazardous material response, mutual aid operations, documentation, and communications management.

3.3.5 Sub-factor 5-ARFF Exercise-1

The offeror shall present their response to the ARFF exercise in a format that clearly describes all steps taken, procedures followed and results achieved from the onset of the scenario to the final resolution of the situation. The offeror shall include but not limited to force configuration, method of force deployment, force deployment force utilization, procedures and checklist utilized, communication management, and mutual aid deployment. (see attachment 7 to section L, Fire exercise #1)

3.3.6 Sub-factor 6- ARFF Exercise-2

The offeror shall present their response to the ARFF exercise in a format that clearly describes all steps taken, procedures followed and results achieved from the onset of the scenario to the final resolution of the situation. The offeror shall include but not limited to force configuration, method of force deployment, force deployment force utilization, procedures and checklist utilized, communication management, and mutual aid deployment. (see attachment 8 to section L, Fire exercise #2)

3.3.7 Sub-factor 7-Maintenance

The offeror shall present their approach to the maintenance of common area utilities and common area facilities, fuels, and improved areas and surfaces as stated in the PWS. The offeror shall present their maintenance approach relating to, but not limited to, staffing configuration and utilization, scheduling and project management, subcontract/subcontractor management, communication management, and project programming, training and certification plan.

3.3.8 Sub-factor 8-Airfield Maintenance

The offeror shall present their approach to the maintenance of airfield surfaces and utilities as stated in the PWS. The offeror shall present their maintenance approach as it relates to, but not limited to, staffing configuration and utilization, scheduling and project management, subcontract/subcontractor management, communication management, and project programming.

3.3.9 Sub-factor 9-Engineering Services

The offeror shall present their approach to providing the engineering services as stated in the PWS. The offeror shall present their engineering approach as it relates to, but not limited to, project management, design support, environmental program management, communication management, training and certification, subcontract/subcontractor management and utilization.

3.4 Factor 2 Proposal Risk

The proposal risk evaluation will assess the risk that the offeror's proposed approach for the requirements of the solicitation will cause significant disruption of schedule, increased costs, or degraded performance. The proposal risk evaluation will focus on the weaknesses associated with an offeror's proposed approach. When mission capability subfactors are established, a proposal risk rating shall be assigned to each mission capability subfactor.

4.0 Volume II

4.1 Factor 3 Past Performance (Performance Confidence Assessment)

4.1.1 General

Each offeror shall submit a Past Performance Volume identifying relevant present and recent past performance. Relevancy of present and recent Past Performance will be based upon the following:

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

A. Work performed on operations and maintenance contracts of similar size and complexity in accordance with the requirements of this solicitation.

B. Similar work performed at a Base/Installation or civil airport with emphasis on the operations and maintenance of an airfield complex.

C. Similar contracts, subcontracts, or teaming arrangements which include the operations of a fire department responsible for either structural fire fighting or ARFF services. Both services do not have to appear on the same contract.

D. Similar contracts, subcontracts, or teaming arrangements that include the operations and management of an armed security force protecting high security facilities and assets.

E. Similar work in size and complexity demonstrating the management of a diverse grouping of functions similar to those listed in this solicitation.

RELEVANCY DEFINITIONS:

a. Highly Relevant –

- Similar contracts, subcontracts, or teaming arrangements which include the operations of a fire department responsible for both airfield structural fire fighting and ARFF services. Both services do not have to appear on the same contract.
- Similar contracts, subcontracts, or teaming arrangements that include the operations and management of an armed security force protecting high security facilities and assets.
- Similar contracts, subcontracts, or teaming arrangements which demonstrate the excellent management of diverse functions of contracts of similar size and complexity.
- Similar work performed at a Base/Installation or civil airport with emphasis on the operations and maintenance of an airfield complex and associated facilities.

c. Relevant –

- Fire Department operations contracts of similar size and complexity for non-airfield/airport structural fire fighting.
- Contracts, subcontracts, or teaming arrangements that include the operations and management of a security force.
- Work performed on operations and maintenance contracts of similar size and complexity at a Base/Installation or civil airport in accordance with the requirements of this solicitation.

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

- Similar work in size and complexity demonstrating the effective management of a diverse grouping of functions similar to those listed in this solicitation.
- Other work included in the PWS not specifically in the above mentioned items, and of similar size, scope and complexity.
- Contracts with equivalent dollar values, contract type, and complexity.

d. **Somewhat Relevant** - Work performed in the areas of fire, security, airfield, and facility maintenance, but not necessarily of similar size and complexity to the requirements of the PWS.

e. **Not Relevant** - Performance on this contract contains relatively no similarities to the performance required by the PWS.

Present and past performance information shall be provided in "Facts Sheets" for each referenced contract. Attachment 2 provides an example format. Contractor format is acceptable provided an item letter to item letter correlation with Attachment 2 is followed. This information is required on the offeror and all subcontractors, teaming partners, and/or joint venture partners proposed to perform aspects of the effort the offeror considers critical to overall successful performance. Offerors are cautioned that the Government will use data provided by each offeror in this volume and data obtained from other sources in the evaluation of past and present performance. The offeror shall submit, along with the information required in this paragraph, a consent letter executed by each subcontractor, teaming partner, and/or joint venture partner authorizing release of adverse past performance information to the offeror so the offeror can respond to such information. For each identified effort for a commercial customer, the offeror shall also submit a client authorization letter (attachment 5), authorizing release to the Government of requested information on the offeror's performance.

Offerors are also requested to send Past Performance questionnaires on each identified relevant program/effort to the Government focal point for that program/effort in an effort to gain responses early. This questionnaire is contained in Attachment 3. Responses to questionnaires are to be provided directly to the Air Force Plant 42 Government contracting officer (ASC/AE Attn: Carolle Henderson-Gilbert, (AFP 42) Bldg 570, room 113, 1175 11th Street, WPAFB, OH 45433-7404). The questionnaire transmittal letter is provided in Attachment 4 and provides instructions for responding to the Government contracting officer. This letter is to be used for U.S. Government contracts. For commercial contracts, a client authorization letter shall be issued to those commercial POC's authorizing/instructing them to complete a Past Performance Questionnaire. A sample client authorization letter is provided in Attachment 5. Offerors shall provide a listing of all contracting officers and program managers the requests for Past Performance Questionnaire and client authorization letters were submitted to (for the offeror's relevant contracts and for critical subcontractors, teaming contractors and/or joint venture partners' relevant contracts) with current contact information. The tracking sheet the government will use to track responses is provided in Attachment 6, use this as a guide for information required on POC's.

4.2 Relevant/Recent Contracts

Submit Past Performance Information on up to five (5) recent contracts that you consider most relevant in demonstrating your ability to perform the proposed effort. Also include information on two (2) recent contracts performed by each (if teaming is proposed) of your teaming partners and significant subcontractors that you consider most relevant in demonstrating their ability to perform the proposed effort. Include rationale supporting your assertion of relevance. The contracts cited must be active or have been closed out within the past three years.

4.3 Specific Content

Offerors are required to explain what aspects of the contracts are deemed relevant to the proposed effort, and to what aspects of the proposed effort they relate. This may include a discussion of efforts accomplished by the offeror to resolve problems encountered on prior contracts as well as past efforts to identify and manage program risk. Merely having problems does not automatically equate to a little or no confidence rating since the problems encountered may have been on a more complex program or an offeror may have subsequently demonstrated the ability to overcome the problems encountered. The offeror is required to clearly demonstrate management actions employed in overcoming problems and the effects of those actions, in terms of improvements achieved or problems rectified. This may allow the offeror to be considered a higher confidence candidate. Submittal of quality performance indicators or other management indicators that clearly support that an offeror has overcome past problems is required. Categorize the relevant information into the specific Mission Capability subfactors used to evaluate the proposal.

Organizational Structure Change History

Many companies have acquired, been acquired by, or otherwise merged with other companies, and/or reorganized their divisions, business groups, subsidiary companies. In many cases, these changes have taken place during the time of performance of relevant present or past efforts or between conclusion of recent past efforts and this source selection. As a result, it is sometimes difficult to determine what past performance is relevant to this acquisition. To facilitate this relevancy determination, include in this proposal volume a “roadmap” describing all such changes in the organization of your company. As part of this explanation, show how these changes impact the relevance of any efforts you identify for past performance evaluation/performance confidence assessment. Since the Government intends to consider present and past performance information provided by other sources as well as that provided by the offeror(s), your “roadmap” should be both specifically applicable to the efforts you identify and general enough to apply to efforts on which the Government receives information from other sources.

4.4 Format

The offeror may expand the answering space on the “Facts Sheet” so that the filled-in “Facts Sheet” for each relevant contract/effort covers no more than both sides of two 8.5 x 11 inch page with ¾ inch margins, spacing of 1.0 and 11 pitch font. The Offeror shall provide the most

current information for the Points of Contact (POCs) identified on the “Facts Sheet.” (Attachment 2)

4.5 Marking

All Past Performance (Performance Confidence Assessment) materials shall include the following legend at the top and bottom of each page:

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION – See FAR 3.104

5.0 VOLUME III COST/PRICE VOLUME,

Factor 4 Cost/Price

GENERAL INFORMATION/INSTRUCTIONS

(a) These instructions are to assist the offeror in developing and presenting the information required in the Cost/Price Volume III. Proper presentation shall ensure that the Cost/Price Volume is fairly evaluated and that the Government is able to understand all assumptions concerning costs/prices presented in the proposal. Price will be evaluated to determine reasonableness of the offerors proposed price. Reasonableness is defined as a price to the Government that a prudent person would pay when consideration is given to prices in the market. Normally, price reasonableness is established through adequate price competition, but may also be determined through price analysis techniques as described in FAR 15.404. All information relating to cost/price must be included in the Cost/Price Volume III. Under no circumstances shall this information be included elsewhere in the proposal.

It is anticipated that pricing of this action will be based on adequate price competition; therefore, offerors are not required to submit certified cost or pricing data. However, if after receipt of proposals it is determined that adequate price competition does not exist, certified cost or pricing data (see FAR 15.406-2, Certificate of Current Cost or Pricing Data) shall be required. If it is determined that adequate price competition does not exist, the offeror shall provide current, accurate, and complete cost or pricing data within 30 days after receipt of the Contracting Officer's request.

(b) CLINs to be proposed by the offeror are fixed price award fee, with the exception of CLIN 0001, Transition Period, which is FFP. The Award Fee CLINS will be proposed by the offeror at a maximum of 8% of the appropriate FPAF Base.

(c) Cost reimbursable amounts are provided by Government at the Government's best estimate of the cost for these CLINS. All offeror's proposals shall be evaluated at the Government estimated amounts for these CLINS. Offeror's **shall not** adjust the Government estimates.

(d) Proposal should be based on a Calendar year, beginning 01 Jan 05. Offeror's shall submit a narrative on the cost/price proposal, including the Fixed Price portions of the proposal.

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

(e) Vehicles will be made available as Government Furnished Property (GFP). The election to use vehicles provided as GFP is on an "all or none" basis. If the offeror elects to propose supplying their own vehicles, the offeror shall submit their proposed price for vehicles on the CLINS indicated in the schedule. In order to eliminate any competitive advantage for using GFP, the Government will add, for evaluation purposes only, \$45,000.00 to base year and each option year. Again, this is for evaluation purposes only.

(f) All other dollar amounts provided shall be rounded to the nearest **dollar**.

(g) Offeror shall comply with the Service Contract Act (SCA) compensation and SCA rate requirements. Information on this can be found at: <https://www.ceals.usace.army.mil/dod-prot/wdolhome.html>

6.0 Volume IV Contract Documentation

6.1 Model Contract/Representations and Certifications

The purpose of this volume is to provide information to the Government for preparing the contract document and supporting file. The information required by FAR 52.215-1(c) (2) is provided in this volume. The offeror's proposal shall include a signed copy of the Model Contract, and Sections A through K. This includes:

6.1.1 Section A - Solicitation/Contract Form

Completion of blocks 12-16 and signature and date for blocks 17 and 18 of the SF33. Signature by the offeror on the SF33 constitutes an offer, which the Government may accept. The "original" copy should be clearly marked under separate cover and should be provided without any punched holes.

6.1.2 Section B - Supplies or Services and Costs/Prices

The offeror shall provide completed pricing information in Section B of the model contract. Data will not be separately priced. Offeror shall specify in the cost/price volume which CLIN the price of data is included in. CLIN 001 Transition shall be Firm Fixed Price. The periods of performance specified in F-001 are the required periods of performance.

6.1.3 Section C - Description/Performance Work Statement

6.1.4 Section E - Inspection and Acceptance

6.1.5 Section F - Deliveries or Performance

The required period of performance currently appears in Section F of the solicitation.

6.1.6 Section G - Contract Administrative Data

The required Contract Administration information is in Section G of the model contract.

6.1.7 Section H - Special Contract Requirements

6.1.8 Section I Contract Clauses

6.1.9 Section K - Representations, Certifications, and other Statements of Offerors

The offeror shall provide completed representations, certifications, acknowledgements, and statements requiring explanation or instruction. The original signed copy should be submitted under separate cover directly to the Procuring Contracting Officer.

6.2 Exceptions to Terms and Conditions

Exceptions taken to terms and conditions of the model contract, to any of its formal attachments, or to any other parts of the solicitation shall be identified. Each exception shall be specifically related to each paragraph and/or specific part of the solicitation to which the exception is taken. Provide rationale in support of the exception and fully explain its impact, if any, on the performance, schedule, cost, and specific requirements of the solicitation. This information shall be provided in the format and content of Table 6.2. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the solicitation may result in the offeror being removed from consideration for award.

Table 6.2 - Solicitation Exceptions

SOLICITATION Document	Paragraph/Page	Requirement/Portion	Rationale
Document Title	Applicable Page and Paragraph Numbers	Identify the requirement or portion to which exception is taken	Justify why the requirement will not be met

6.3 Other Information Required

6.3.1 Authorized Offeror Personnel

Provide the name, title and telephone number of the company/division point of contact regarding decisions made with respect to your proposal and who can obligate your company contractually. Also, identify those individuals authorized to negotiate with the Government as well as the name, title, and telephone number of the CEO, Division President, and/or Vice President.

6.3.2 Government Offices

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Provide the mailing address, telephone and fax numbers and facility codes for the cognizant Contract Administration Office, DCAA, and Government Paying Office. Also, provide the name, telephone and fax number for the Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO).

6.3.3 Company/Division Address, Identifying Codes, and Applicable Designations

Provide company/division's street address, county and facility code; Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) code; Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) code; size of business (large or small); and labor surplus area designation.

6.3.4 Government Furnished Property (GFP) and/or Base Support Requirements

The Government plans to provide the items listed in section J attachment 9, property listing (PIXS library) as GFP/Base Support.

7.0 Volume V Attachments to the Model Contract

The offeror shall provide attachments to the model contract if needed.

SECTION L ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 TO SECTION L

Cross Reference Matrix

(To be completed by Offeror)

For Prospective Offerors: See paragraph 2.1.5.8 regarding instructions for completion of the solicitation Cross Reference Matrix. If this matrix conflicts with any other requirement, direction or provision of this solicitation, the other reference shall take precedence over this matrix. Additionally, to the extent this matrix discloses details as to the extent or manner by which the Government intends to evaluate offeror's proposals for award, Section M references in the matrix are for information purposes only and the Government shall be obligated to evaluate proposals solely in conformance with the provisions of the Section M of the solicitation.

An example of the format is shown below:

Proposal Para	CLIN	PWS	Sec. L	Sec. M	CDRL	Model Contract
2.1.2		1.1.2	3.3	2.3	A004	Sec. J

ATTACHMENT 2 TO SECTION L
Past Performance “Facts Sheet”
(To be completed by Offeror)

Request the Offeror complete a separate Facts Sheet for each relevant contract. See Section L of this RFP for detailed instructions and limits on number and recency of contracts. Offeror is requested to provide frank, concise comments regarding present/past performance on the program identified in B. below.

A. OFFEROR: (Including: (1) Name (Company/Division), (2) Address, (3) CAGE Code)

B. PROGRAM TITLE and CONTRACT NUMBER:

C. NAME OF CONTRACTING ACTIVITY OR CUSTOMER:

D. CONTRACT TYPE (S) – PLEASE LIST ALL THAT APPLY (e.g., firm fixed price, time & materials)

E. CONTRACT \$ VALUE:

1. Original Contract \$ Value:
2. Current \$ Value:
3. Estimate @ Completion:
4. Primary causes of changes:
5. If an Award Fee Contract, within the last 3 years, what was the percentage of the award fee for each period? Provide rating and accompanying rationale.

F. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF EFFORT AS: _____ PRIME _____ SUBCONTRACTOR

(As a part of this narrative description, please highlight portions considered *most relevant* to the current acquisition; addressing each Mission Capability Sub-factor (if applicable) in the current acquisition as to how and to what extent each Sub-factor relates to the program identified in B above. **LEASE NOTE: The Government is not bound by the offeror's opinion of relevancy. The Government will perform an independent assessment of relevancy of the data provided or obtained.**

G. PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE:

1. Original Schedule:
2. Current Schedule:
3. Estimate @ Completion:
4. How many times changed:
5. Primary causes of changes:

H. PRIMARY POINTS OF CONTACT: (The Offeror is responsible for exerting its **best efforts** to ensure that current information is provided for all individuals.)

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Name and Office Symbol	Phone Number	FAX Number
1. Procuring Contracting Officer	DSN & Comm	DSN & Comm
2. Program Manager	DSN & Comm	DSN & Comm
3. Administrative Contracting Officer	DSN & Comm	DSN & Comm
4. Other (Please Specify)	DSN & Comm	DSN & Comm

I. Specify, by name, key individual(s) who will participate in the proposed effort under acquisition who also participated in the program identified in B. above and indicate their contract role. Describe how participation of these key personnel contributed to the success of the previous effort and how this indicates probability of success on the proposed effort.

J. Use this space to address any aspect of this program considered unique. Describe quality awards or certifications that indicate the Offeror possesses a high-quality process for delivering the product/service required.

K. Summarize contract issues relative to the number and severity of quality deficiencies recorded/contract discrepancy reports issued, cure notices, show cause letters, termination for default or cause, disputes, claims, latent defects, and corrective actions taken.

ATTACHMENT 3 TO SECTION L
Past Performance Questionnaire

I. CONTRACT IDENTIFICATION

A. Contractor (Company/Division): _____

B. Contract Number/Type (e.g., FFP, CPFF): _____

C. Contract Title: _____

D. Brief Contract Description: _____

E. Period of Performance: _____

II. RESPONDENT (S) TO QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Name(s): _____

B. Phone Number(s): _____

C. Position (e.g., Program Integrator, PCO/ACO): _____

D. Other suggested points of contact: _____

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

III. GENERAL COMMENTS

IV. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

NOTE: Remarks may be continued on separate pages. Please identify category and question number. Ratings are defined as follows: **B (lue)** Exceptional. Offeror's performance with the area of evaluation clearly exceeds requirements. **G (reen)** Satisfactory. Offeror's performance meets requirements. Problems exist/existed but can/were managed effectively. **Y (ellow)** Marginal. Offeror's performance meets most, but not all, requirements. Problems exist/existed in significant area(s) and Offeror management attention is/was need. **R (ed)** Unsatisfactory. Offeror's performance does/did not meet requirements. There are/were multiple problem areas. Offeror is generally ineffective. **N/A** Does not apply to reported offeror's performance. **U (nknown)** No knowledge of the offeror's performance within the area of evaluation.

A. MISSION CAPABILITY - Rate the OFFEROR's performance in the following areas:**1. Management**

a. Experience in establishing sub contractual arrangements and managing those relationships.

B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

b. Experience in establishing an Integrated Normal Maintenance Plan and successful management to that plan.

B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

c. Experience in developing an Integrated Schedule and successfully managing projects to that schedule.

B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

d. Experience in establishing and using metrics to manage projects.

B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

2. Security Force Protection

a. Experience in developing and implementing an armed security and law enforcement operation

B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

b. Experience in developing, updating and maintaining a Installation Security Plan in accordance with AFI 31-101

B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

c. Experience in providing 360 degree coverage, and rapid response to a Protection Level 2 or 3 resource (or equivalent) 24/7.

B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

3. Fire Fighting

a. Experience in performance of Fire Protection Services, Emergency Medical/transportation service, hazardous material response, mutual aid service, fire alarm communication dispatch service and/or Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting (ARFF) Services on a 24-hour basis

B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

b. Experience in the development and implementation of proficiency training for fire department personnel along with developing and maintaining a certification program.

B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

c. Experience in the development and implementation of Operational Risk Management (ORM) plans.

B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

4. Maintenance

Experience in the maintenance of buildings, mechanical systems, utility systems, and vehicle maintenance.

B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

b. Experience in the planning and maintenance of improved pavements (roads and walkways), and storm drainage systems

B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

c. Experience in providing vehicle maintenance for general purpose fleet and maintenance of highly specialized equipment such as fire fighting crash and rescue vehicles

B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

d. Ability to provide accurate and effective scheduling and coordination between various maintenance operations

B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

e. Accuracy of schedule reports

B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

5. Airfield Maintenance

a. Experience in the planning and maintenance of airfield pavements (runways, taxiways and ramps), airfield utility systems, and airfield navigation aids.

B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

b. Accuracy of schedule reports

B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

6. Engineering Services

a. Timeliness of schedule reports

B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

b. Developing/executing integrated program plans to include all participating activities, such as, Government and key subcontractors

B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

c. Developing/managing to event-driven schedules with clear entrance/exit criteria for key events.

Schedules include in- house and subcontracted activities B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

d. Schedule development activity/procedures (Provide details pertaining to their ability to maintain a realistic schedule and to perform realistic schedule estimates for projects, ECPs or other program changes)

B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

e. Cost estimating activity/procedures (Provide details pertaining to their ability to maintain realistic Estimate at Completion and performing Realistic estimates for ECPs and other program changes)

B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

B. COST/PRICE - Rate the offeror's performance as it relates to:

a. Adherence to estimated costs and contract goals. B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

(1) Original Contract Price \$ _____

(2) Actual/Projected Price \$ _____

- Explanation of Deltas:

- Out-of-Scope Changes \$ _____

- Cost Overruns \$ _____

b. Accuracy of cost reports B G Y R N/A

REMARKS: _____

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

c Timeliness of cost reports	B	G	Y	R	N/A
REMARKS:	<hr/>				

d. Cost estimating activity/procedures (Provide details pertaining to their ability to maintain realistic Estimate at Completion and performing Realistic estimates for ECPs and other program changes)	B	G	Y	R	N/A
REMARKS:	<hr/>				

ATTACHMENT 4 TO SECTION L
Past Performance Questionnaire Transmittal Letter
(To be completed by Offeror)

MEMORANDUM FOR: [OFFEROR'S POC]

FROM: [OFFEROR'S ADDRESS AND POINT OF CONTACT]

SUBJECT: Present/Past Performance Questionnaire for Contract(s).

1. We are currently responding to the Department of the Air Force (AF), Wright-Patterson Air Force Base (WPAFB), Request For Proposal (RFP) FA8623-04-R-6350, for the procurement of the Air Force Plant 42 Operations and Maintenance Contract. This RFP is being conducted as a Source Selection and specifically requires that we, as an Offeror, do the following:

The Offeror shall send out and track the completion of the Present/Past Performance Questionnaires to each of the Offeror's critical subcontractors', teaming subcontractors' and/or joint venture partners' Points of Contact (POC's). The responsibility to send out and track the completion of the Present/Past Performance Questionnaires rests solely with the Offeror - i.e., it shall not be delegated to any subcontractors, team contractors, and/or joint venture partners. The Offeror shall exert its best efforts to ensure that at least two POC's, per relevant contract, submits a completed Present/Past Performance Questionnaire **directly to the Government not later than [OFFEROR FILL-IN RFP CLOSING DATE** (30th calendar day after RFP release)]. Each of the Offeror's POC's shall **telefax** its' completed Present/Past Performance Questionnaire directly to:

ASC/AE, Bldg. 570, Room 113

ATTN: Ms. Carolle Henderson-Gilbert (AFP 42 O&M)

1175 Eleventh Street

WPAFB OH 45433-7404

Reference: RFP: FA8623-04-R-6350

The WPAFB unclassified telefax number is (937) 656-7192. Mailing the questionnaire(s) to the address above is an acceptable alternative method of transmission. If mailing, the outside envelope must be marked as follows:

NOTE: TO BE OPENED BY ADDRESSEE ONLY

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - See FAR 3.104

SOURCE SELECTION SENSITIVE - FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

2. We have identified subject contract(s) as relevant to this acquisition and you as our POC. As such, please take a few moments of your time to fill out the attached questionnaire and send it directly to WPAFB. The information contained in the completed Present/Past Performance Questionnaires are considered sensitive and cannot be released to us, the Offeror. If you have any questions about the acquisition or the attached questionnaire, your questions must be directed to the Government's points of contact identified above. Thank you for your timely assistance.

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Sincerely,

Attachment(s) [OFFEROR'S POINT OF CONTACT]
Present/Past Performance Questionnaire
[Client Authorization Letter(s), if applicable]

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - See FAR 3.104 SOURCE SELECTION

ATTACHMENT 5 TO SECTION L
Past Performance Client Authorization Letter
(To be completed by Offeror)

Dear (Client):

We are currently responding to the Department of the Air Force (AF), Wright-Patterson Air Force Base (WPAFB), Request For Proposal (RFP) FA8623-04-R-6350, for the procurement of the Air Force Plant 42 Operations and Maintenance Contract.

As you know an Offeror's past performance has become an element of increased emphasis in the AF's acquisitions. They are requesting that clients of companies who submit proposals in response to their RFP for the AF Plant 42 Operations and Maintenance Program be contacted, and that their participation in the validation process be requested. We, therefore, respectfully request and hereby authorize you to complete the attached Questionnaire with regards to work we have performed for you, and forward it directly to the Government Point(s) of Contact at the following address:

ASC/AE, Bldg. 570, Room 113
ATTN: Ms Carolle Henderson-Gilbert (AF Plant 42 Program)
1175 Eleventh Street
WPAFB OH 45433-7404
Reference: RFP: FA8623-04-R-6350

The WPAFB unclassified telefax number is (937) 656-7192. Mailing the questionnaire(s) to the above address is an acceptable alternative method of transmission. If mailing, the outside envelope must be marked as follows:

NOTE: TO BE OPENED BY ADDRESSEE ONLY
SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION – See FAR 3.104
SOURCE SELECTION SENSITIVE – FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

We have identified Mr./Ms. (Name) of your organization as the point of contact based on their knowledge concerning our work. Your cooperation in this matter is appreciated. Any questions may be directed to: [NAME, PHONE NUMBER, FAX NUMBER FOR THE OFFEROR'S POINT OF CONTACT] Please complete and return the attached questionnaire to this above address by no later than [INSERT VOLUME DUE DATE].

Sincerely,

[OFFEROR'S POINT OF CONTACT]

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - See FAR 3.104

ATTACHMENT 6 TO SECTION L
Past Performance Questionnaire Tracking Record
(To be completed by Offeror)

OFFEROR'S REFERENCES COMPANY/AGENCY NAME:					
REFERENCE NAME:					
REFERENCE ADDRESS:					
CONTRACT NUMBER REFERENCE:					
Date Of Action	Type Of Action (E.G., Sent Questionnaire, Follow-Up Call)	Person Contacted/ Phone #	Company Position Of Person Contacted	Offeror Contact	Status Of Questionnaire

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - See FAR 3.104

Note: One **Past Performance Questionnaire Tracking Record** is required for each Questionnaire sent out.

ATTACHMENT 7 TO SECTION L FIRE EXERCISE # 1

ARFF Exercise #1

This is an Air Force exercise for the fire department.

- A C-5 aircraft has just landed on Runway 25
- Upon landing the pilot reported smoke in the Cargo area.
- The landing gear collapsed and the aircraft came to rest on runway 25.
- All engines were shut down.
- Four crewmen evacuated to a safe area outside the aircraft.
- One crewman failed to exit the aircraft and is unaccounted for.
- Information provided at the time of the landing is as follows:

5 - Crewmen (no passengers)

18,000 gallons of fuel remaining

Wind speed and direction:

- Wind blowing toward the nose of the aircraft
- Gusting up to 15 knots

Assumptions:

- No debris from aircraft on runway
- No hazardous cargo
- No outside mutual aid available
- All Air Force Plant 42 Fire Department assigned vehicles available
- Outside notifications simulated
- Exercise terminated when victim taken to a safe area

Task:

1. Describe responding vehicles required.

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

2. Describe manning of responding vehicles.
3. Describe responding vehicle approach from fire stations to the final positioning in relationship to the aircraft. Provide function of each person in the vehicle during approach and final positioning.
4. Describe function of each firefighter during ground operations (fire attack, aircraft entry, rescue operations, etc).
5. Describe required personnel protective equipment (PPE) for the entire exercise.
6. Describe the Incident Management system.
7. Describe the interface, discussion, and actions, if any that you would take place with the security forces assigned to the installation

NOTE:

The final RFP for ARFF Exercise #1 will include a map depicting exact location and orientation of the aircraft in relation to the fire stations.

ATTACHMENT 8 TO SECTION L FIRE EXERCISE # 2

ARFF Exercise #2

This is an Air Force exercise for the fire department.

- A hydrazine leak was reported in the north end of building 210
- All personnel were evacuated except one employee was unaccounted for

Assumptions

- No outside mutual aid available
- All Air Force Plant 42 Fire Department assigned vehicles available
- Outside notifications simulated
- Exercise terminated when victim taken to a safe area

Task:

1. Describe responding vehicles required.
2. Describe manning of responding vehicles.
3. Describe responding vehicle approach from fire stations to the final positioning in relationship to the incident site. Provide function of each person in the vehicle during approach and final positioning.
4. Describe function of each firefighter during ground operations (fire attack, building entry, rescue operations, etc).
5. Describe required personnel protective equipment (PPE) for the entire exercise.
6. Describe the Incident Management system.
7. Describe the interface, discussion, and actions, if any that you would take place with the on-site building security forces assigned to the interior building and installation security forces.

NOTE:

The final RFP for ARFF Exercise #2 will include a map depicting exact location of the incident, general building floor plan, and atmospheric conditions.

ATTACHMENT 9 TO SECTION L SECURITY FORCES EXERCISE

This is an exercise for the security department.

- Given 5 Entry Control Points and a fixed number of patrols.
- AFP 42 Installation declares a FPCON elevation level will be required for the next 30 days due to a ground based terrorist threat at Plant 42.
- 15 Days into the surge period an in-flight emergency is declared that results in the crash landing of a Protection Level II aircraft.
- At the same time it is reported that an unknown number of intruders have jumped the fence and are heading for either the north side of the installation or Site 5.
- Both incidents require a response and actions to secure the area.
- Briefly describe the manning of the ECPs and number of patrols on a normal duty day. (ALPHA)
- Briefly describe the manning of the ECPs and the number of patrols at elevated FPCONS (BRAVO, CHARLIE, DELTA)
- Briefly describe your response actions to this type of incident assuming you are at FPCON CHARLIE.
 - o How you would maintain 360 degree security protective coverage for Protection Level II aircraft while still maintaining security of the installation?
 - o What actions, if any, should the different positions take in this scenario?

NOTE:

The final RFP for the Security Exercise will include a map depicting the exact location of the IFE aircraft, Det 1 HQ and overall plant boundaries.

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Air Force Plant 42

Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award

December 13, 2004

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

I. NOTICE: The following solicitation provisions pertinent to this section are hereby incorporated by reference:

A. FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION SOLICITATION PROVISIONS

52.217-05 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JUL 1990)
52.247-47 EVALUATION—F.O.B. ORIGIN (JUN 2003)
52.247-49 DESTINATION UNKNOWN (APR 1984)

B. AIR FORCE FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATIONS SOLICITATION PROVISIONS

5315.305 PROPOSAL EVALUATION (APR 2003)

C. AIR FORCE MATERIAL COMMAND FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION SUPPLEMENT SOLICITATION PROVISIONS

II. NOTICE: The following solicitation provisions pertinent to this section are hereby incorporated in full text:

OTHER SOLICITATION PROVISIONS IN FULL TEXT

M001 SOURCE SELECTION (OCT 2004)

1.1 Basis for Selection

The Government will select the best overall offer, based upon an integrated assessment of Mission Capability, Proposal Risk, Past Performance, and Cost/Price. This is a best value source selection conducted in accordance with the current Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (AFFARS) Mandatory Procedures (MP) 5315.3 Source Selection. A contract may be awarded to the offeror who is deemed responsible in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), as supplemented, whose proposal conforms to the solicitation's requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by Section L of this solicitation) and is judged, based on the evaluation factors and sub-factors to represent the best value to the Government. The Government seeks to award to the offeror who provides the Air Force the greatest confidence that it will best meet or exceed the requirements, and does so affordably. This may result in an award to a higher rated, higher priced offeror, where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors and the Source Selection Authority (SSA) reasonably determines that the mission capability and/or overall business approach is superior, that there is less program risk and/or superior past performance of the higher priced offeror which outweighs the cost difference. The Government may award to other than the lowest evaluated cost/price, or to other than the highest technically superior offeror. To arrive at a source selection decision, the SSA will integrate the source selection team's evaluations of the evaluation factors and sub-factors (described below). While the

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Government source selection evaluation team and the SSA will strive for maximum objectivity, the source selection process, by its nature, is subjective and, therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process.

1.2 Number of Contracts to be awarded

The Government intends to award one contract for the Air Force Plant 42 program. However, based on cost and other considerations, the Government reserves the right to not award a contract at all.

1.3 Rejection of Unrealistic Offers

The Government may reject any proposal that is evaluated and determined to be unrealistic in terms of program commitments, including contract terms and conditions, or unrealistically high or low in cost/price when compared to Government estimates, such that the proposal is deemed to reflect an inherent lack of competence or failure to comprehend the complexity and risks of the program.

1.4 Correction Potential of Proposals

The Government will consider, throughout the evaluation, the "correction potential" of any deficiency. The judgment of such "correction potential" is within the sole discretion of the Government. If an aspect of an offeror's proposal, not meeting the Government's requirements, is considered uncorrectable, the offeror may be eliminated from the competitive range.

M002 EVALUATION CRITERIA (OCT 2004)

1.1 Evaluation Factors and Sub-factors and their Relative Order of Importance

Award will be made to the offeror proposing the combination most advantageous to the Government based upon an integrated assessment of the evaluation factors and sub-factors described below. The evaluation factors are not of equal importance. Within the Mission Capability factor, sub-factors 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 are of equal importance, and greater in importance than sub-factors 7, 8, and 9. Sub-factors 7 and 8 are of equal importance. Sub-factor 9 is of less importance than Sub-factors 1-8. Mission Capability, Proposal Risk, and Past Performance factors will be rated with the same importance, with each of these three factors (Mission Capability, Proposal Risk, and Past Performance) rated more important than cost/price. In accordance with FAR 15.304(e), the evaluation factors other than cost/price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost/price; however, cost/price will contribute substantially to the selection decision.

Factor 1: Mission Capability

- Sub-factor 1- Management
- Sub-factor 2- Security Forces Protection
- Sub-factor 3- Security Forces Exercise
- Sub-factor 4- Fire Fighting
- Sub-factor 5- ARFF Exercise # 1
- Sub-factor 6- ARFF Exercise # 2
- Sub-factor 7- Maintenance
- Sub-factor 8- Airfield Maintenance
- Sub-factor 9- Engineering Services

Factor 2: Proposal Risk

Factor 3: Past Performance

Factor 4: Cost/Price

1.2 Factors and Sub-factor Rating Methodology

1.2.1 Color Ratings

A color rating as defined in MP5315.305 Proposal Evaluation, Table 1, will be assigned to each sub-factor under the Mission Capability factor. The color rating depicts how well the offeror's proposal meets the Mission Capability sub-factor requirements in accordance with the stated evaluation criteria and solicitation requirements. In arriving at a Best Value decision, the Government reserves the right to assign positive consideration (strength) for performance/service in excess of the specified performance requirements. "Strength" is a significant, outstanding, or exceptional aspect of an offeror's proposal that has merit and exceeds specified performance requirements in a way that is advantageous to the government, and either will be included in the contract or is inherent in the offeror's process.

1.2.2 Proposal Risk

The proposal risk evaluation factor assesses the risk that the offeror's proposed approach for the requirements of the solicitation will cause significant disruption of schedule, increased costs, or degraded performance. The proposal risk evaluation focuses on the weaknesses associated with an offeror's proposed approach. When mission capability subfactors are established, a proposal risk rating shall be assigned to each mission capability subfactor and an overall factor-level rating is not assigned.

1.2.3 Past Performance

The past performance evaluation factor assesses the degree of confidence the government has in an offeror's ability to provide services that meet users' needs, including cost and schedule, based on a demonstrated record of performance. The past performance evaluation results in an

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

assessment of the government's confidence in the offeror's ability to fulfill the solicitation requirements while meeting schedule, budget, and performance quality constraints. The past performance evaluation considers each offeror's demonstrated record of performance in supplying products and services that meet users' needs. The performance confidence assessment will be assessed at an overall factor level after evaluating aspects of the offeror's recent past performance, focusing on performance that is relevant to the mission capability subfactors and cost or price.

1.2.4 Cost/Price

Price will be evaluated to determine the reasonableness of the offerors proposed price. Reasonableness is defined as a price to the Government that a prudent person would pay when consideration is given to prices in the market. Normally, price reasonableness is established through adequate price competition, but may also be determined through price analysis techniques as described in FAR 15.404. In order to eliminate any competitive advantage for using GFP, the Government will add, for evaluation purposes only, \$45,000.00 to base year and each option year. Again, this is for evaluation purposes only.

1.2.5 Integrated Assessment

When the integrated assessment of all aspects of the evaluation is accomplished, the color ratings, proposal risk ratings, performance confidence assessment, and evaluated cost/price will be considered in the order of priority listed in paragraph 1.1 above. Any of these considerations can influence the SSA's decision.

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

1.3 Factor 1 – Mission Capability

A color rating as defined in (AFFARS) MP5315.305 Proposal Evaluation, Table 1, will be assigned to each sub-factor under the Mission Capability factor. Mission Capability ratings focus on the strengths and deficiencies in the offeror's proposal. The color rating depicts how well the offeror's proposal meets the Mission Capability sub-factor requirements in accordance with the stated evaluation criteria and solicitation requirements.

TABLE 1 - MISSION CAPABILITY RATINGS		
Color	Rating	Description
Blue	Exceptional	Exceeds specified minimum performance or capability requirements in a way beneficial to the government; proposal must have one or more strengths and no deficiencies to receive a blue.
Green	Acceptable	Meets specified minimum performance or capability requirements delineated in the Request for Proposal; proposal rated green must have no deficiencies but may have one or more strengths.
Yellow	Marginal	Does not clearly meet some specified minimum performance or capability requirements delineated in the Request for Proposal, but any such uncertainty is correctable.
Red	Unacceptable	Fails to meet specified minimum performance or capability requirements; proposal has one or more deficiencies. Proposals with an unacceptable rating are not awardable.

1.3.1 Sub-factor 1 Management

Your technical proposal will be evaluated for the adequacy of your approach to providing integrated management of the following in meeting the diverse requirements identified in the Performance Work Statement (PWS):

- Integration of Multiple Functions (Prioritization/Scheduling)
- Quality Control
- Personnel Management/Training/Certification
- Safety Program Management
- Government Furnished Property
- Information Technology
- Implementation of Cost Control, and Scope and Time Management
- Fleet maintenance and management

Measure of Merit:

This subfactor is met when the offeror's proposal demonstrates:

The capability to manage in an integrated fashion the multiple diverse functions (security, fire, etc.) necessary to ensure continuous operations including emergencies. Proper staffing with qualified personnel to accomplish the PWS requirements.

1.3.2 Sub-factor 2 – Security Forces Protection

Description:

Your technical proposal will be evaluated for the adequacy of your approach to providing priority resource protection while maintaining law and order, in accordance with the security force protection requirements (PWS Section 9).

- Management of a security force
- Communications Center administration
- Force protection condition measures
- Training, Certification, and Documentation
- Installation Security and Full Spectrum Threat Plan management

Measure of Merit

This subfactor is met when the offeror's proposal demonstrates:

- Their understanding, experience, and ability to provide adequate security forces to protect the PFTI, roving patrols capable of emergency response for protecting priority resources, and manning entry control point gates.
- An in-depth knowledge of performing security force operations on a Government installation.
- An understanding of the interrelationships between protecting priority resources and meeting emergency response time, while maintaining law and order.

1.3.3 Sub-factor 3 –Security Forces Exercise

Description:

Your technical proposal will be evaluated for the adequacy of your approach to providing an armed security response while maintaining law and order, in accordance with the security force protection requirements (PWS Section 9).

- Threat prioritization
- Contingency response measures
- Personnel management
- Controlled Area access controls
- Engaging a hostile force.

This sub-factor has been met when the offeror demonstrates:

The experience necessary to evaluate/implement operational procedures, along with the management of personnel and equipment. The offeror's proposed solution to the SECURITY FORCES EXERCISE (attch. 9 to Section L) demonstrates their understanding of the interrelationships between protecting priority resources and meeting emergency response times, while maintaining law and order in accordance with established Air Force Standards identified in the PWS Section 9.

1.3.4 Sub-factor 4 –Fire Fighting

Description:

Your technical proposal will be evaluated for the adequacy of your approach to providing fire prevention, a fire fighting program, mutual aid operations, and the hazardous material response requirements.

- Fire Department Staffing and Organizational Structure
- Management of fire and emergency services
- Fire Alarm Communications Center administration
- Training Program, Certification, and Documentation
- Aircraft emergency response management
- Self inspection program development and administration.

This sub factor is met when the offeror's proposal demonstrates:

Experience and the ability to adequately staff for and administer a fire fighting program, a fire prevention program, and hazardous material response program. A thorough working knowledge of AFI 32-2001, AFI 32-4002, NFPA and OSHA requirements as they relate to operations at an Air Force facility as identified in PWS Section 5. Also, demonstrate an understanding of the interrelationships between fire fighting, mutual aid operations, and responding to hazardous material incidents.

1.3.5 Sub-factor 5 –ARFF Exercise # 1

Description: : Your technical proposal will be evaluated for the adequacy of your approach to providing fire a fighting program, aircrew extraction, and the hazardous material response requirements of the particular scenario. Your response to the scenario will be presented as a table top exercise where maps, drawings and descriptions of your solution may be used to convey the technical intent of your approach.

Measure of Merit:

This subfactor is met when the offeror's proposal demonstrates:

Experience, and the ability to manage and administer a fire fighting program in accordance with AFI 32-2001. The offeror's proposed solution to the ARFF EXERCISE #1 (attch. 7 to Section L) further demonstrates their understanding and working knowledge of ARFF requirements for Air Force installations.

1.3.6 Sub-factor 6- ARFF Exercise # 2

Description: : Your technical proposal will be evaluated for the adequacy of your approach to providing fire a fighting program, aircrew extraction, and the hazardous material response requirements of the particular scenario. Your response to the scenario will be presented as a table top exercise where maps, drawings and descriptions of your solution may be used to convey the technical intent of your approach.

Measure of Merit:

This subfactor is met when the offeror's proposal demonstrates:

experience, and the ability to manage and administer a fire fighting program in accordance with AFI 32-2001. The offeror's proposed solution to the ARFF EXERCISE #2 (attch. 8 to Section L) further demonstrates their understanding and working knowledge of ARFF requirements for Air Force installations.

1.3.7 Sub-factor 7 Maintenance

Description

Your technical proposal will be evaluated for the adequacy of your approach to providing grounds maintenance and normal maintenance operations for AFP 42 facilities, utility systems and airfield complex located in the common use area as identified in PWS Section 7. Proper staffing with qualified personnel to accomplish the PWS requirements

Measure of Merit:

This subfactor is met when the offeror's proposal demonstrates:

An understanding of the interrelationships between implementing the normal maintenance plan, scheduling techniques, and keeping all utility systems operational and the management of those diverse tasks related to maintenance and operations.

- An understanding of the quality control necessary to meet the PWS requirements.

- An understanding of scheduling and supervision of multiple concurrent tasks.

- An understanding of maintenance and operations of POL systems

- Experience with vehicle maintenance and repair

- Development and implementation of a Normal Maintenance Plan

- Personnel management, training and certifications

1.3.8 Sub-factor 8 Airfield Maintenance

Description:

Your technical proposal will be evaluated for the adequacy of your approach to providing airfield maintenance operations for AFP 42 facilities, utility systems and airfield complex located in the common use area as identified in PWS Section 3. Proper staffing with qualified personnel to accomplish the PWS requirements

Measure of Merit:

This subfactor is met when the offeror's proposal demonstrates:

An understanding of the interrelationships between implementing the normal maintenance plan, scheduling techniques, while at the same time maintaining an active airfield complex, keeping all utility systems operational including:

- An understanding of the quality control necessary to meet the PWS requirements.
- An understanding of scheduling and supervision of multiple concurrent tasks.
- Personnel management, training and certifications

1.3.9 Sub-factor 9 Engineering Services

Description:

Your technical proposal will be evaluated for the adequacy of your approach to providing for engineering design, construction management and budget preparation as identified in PWS Section 4.

Measure of Merit:

This subfactor is met when the offeror's proposal demonstrates:

An understanding, experience, and ability to manage diverse tasks related to engineering design, construction management and budget preparation. A thorough understanding of the interrelationships required for coordination and scheduling between engineering, maintenance, fire and security as defined in the PWS. An understanding of construction management principles and coordination on major common area Capital Type Rehabilitation (CTR) projects necessary to ensure best value for the Government.

1.4 Factor 2 - Proposal Risk

The proposal risk evaluation focuses on the weaknesses associated with an offeror's proposed approach. The proposal risk evaluation will assess the risk that the offeror's proposed approach for the requirements of the solicitation will cause significant disruption of schedule, increased costs, poor performance, the need for increased government oversight, and the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. A proposal risk rating shall be assigned to each mission capability sub factor and an overall factor-level rating is not assigned. Each Mission Capability sub-factor, will receive a low, moderate, or high proposal risk rating as defined in (AFFARS) MP5315.305 Proposal Evaluation Table 2- Proposal Risk Ratings:

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

TABLE 2 - PROPOSAL RISK RATINGS	
Rating	Description
High	Likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Risk may be unacceptable even with special contractor emphasis and close government monitoring.
Moderate	Can potentially cause disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close government monitoring will likely be able to overcome difficulties.
Low	Has little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.

The order of importance is: within the Mission Capability factor, sub-factors 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 are of equal importance, and greater in importance than sub-factors 7, 8, and 9. Sub-factors 7 and 8 are of equal importance. Sub-factor 9 is of less importance than each of the Sub-factors 1-8. Mission Capability is more important than Cost/Price.

This factor has been met when the offeror provides:

- (a) A summary of their risk management process.
- (b) The offeror identifies and provides a listing of risks to the program and mitigation plans for those risks identified. Risks should include the potential for disruption of schedule, increased cost, degradation of performance, and the need for increased Government oversight as well as the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. For any risk identified, the evaluation will consider the offeror's proposal for mitigating those risks and why that risk is or is not manageable.

1.5 Factor 3 - Past Performance

1.5.1 Performance Confidence Assessment

The past performance evaluation factor will assess the degree of confidence the government has in an offeror's ability to perform the requirements, including cost and schedule, based on a demonstrated record of performance. Performance Confidence will be evaluated at the Mission Capability sub-factor and Cost/Price factor level and assigned as a single rating at the Past Performance factor level. The Government will evaluate the offeror's demonstrated record of contract compliance in supplying services that meet user's needs, including cost and schedule.

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Each offeror will receive one of the following confidence ratings described in AFFARS MP5315.305 Table 3-Performance Confidence Assessments listed below:

TABLE 3- PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENTS	
Rating	Description
HIGH CONFIDENCE	Based on the offeror's performance record, the government has high confidence the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. ⁱ
SIGNIFICANT CONFIDENCE	Based on the offeror's performance record, the government has significant confidence the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. ⁱⁱ
SATISFACTORY CONFIDENCE	Based on the offeror's performance record, the government has confidence the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Normal contractor emphasis should preclude any problems.
UNKNOWN CONFIDENCE	No performance record is identifiable.
LITTLE CONFIDENCE	Based on the offeror's performance record, substantial doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
NO CONFIDENCE	Based on the offeror's performance record, extreme doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

1.5.2 Relevance and Recency

The Past Performance evaluation is an assessment of the government's confidence in the offeror's ability to fulfill the solicitation requirements while meeting schedule, budget, and performance quality constraints. The Past Performance evaluation will consider each offeror's demonstrated record of performance in providing the services that meet the user's needs. The performance confidence assessment will be assessed at an overall factor level after evaluating aspects of the offeror's recent (within the last three years) past performance, focusing on performance that is relevant to the mission capability sub factors and cost or price.

The offeror should indicate those current or recently completed contracts that they consider relevant and indicate why they feel they are. The offeror shall not submit experience older than three years. The information may include data on efforts performed by other divisions, critical subcontractors, or teaming contractors, if such resources will be brought to bear or significantly influence the performance of the proposed effort. The Government may consider as relevant efforts performed for agencies of the federal, state, or local governments and commercial customers. Each cited contract/workload will be assigned an assessment reflecting its degree of relevance to the Air Force Plant 42 work according to the following definitions:

a. Highly Relevant - Similar contracts, subcontracts, or teaming arrangements which include the operations of a fire department responsible for either structural fire fighting or ARFF services. Both services do not have to appear on the same contract. Similar contracts,

SECTION L&M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

subcontracts, or teaming arrangements that include the operations and management of an armed security force protecting high security facilities and assets.

b. Relevant –

- Work performed on operations and maintenance contracts of similar size and complexity in accordance with the requirements of this solicitation.
- Similar work performed at a Base/Installation or civil airport with emphasis on the operations and maintenance of an airfield complex.
- Similar work in size and complexity demonstrating the management of a diverse grouping of functions similar to those listed in this solicitation.
- Factors found during interviews, surveys, and performance report reviews.
- Contracts with equivalent dollar values, contract type, and complexity.

c. Somewhat Relevant - Work performed using the same or similar manufacturing processes.

d. Not Relevant - Performance on this contract contains relatively no similarities to the performance required by the PWS.

1.5.3 Unknown Confidence

Offerors without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance and, as a result, will receive a "Unknown Confidence" rating for the Past Performance factor.

1.5.4 Past Performance Problems

Where relevant performance records indicate performance problems, the Government will consider the number and severity of the problems and the appropriateness and effectiveness of any corrective actions taken (not just planned or promised). The Government may review more recent contracts or performance evaluations to ensure corrective actions have been implemented and to evaluate their effectiveness.

1.5.5 Other considerations

In addition to evaluating the extent to which the offeror's performance meets mission requirements, the assessment will consider things such as the offeror's history of forecasting and controlling costs, adhering to schedules (including the administrative aspects of performance), reasonable and cooperative behavior and commitment to customer satisfaction, and generally, the contractor's business-like concern for the interest of the customer.

1.5.6 Methods

Past performance information will be obtained through the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting Systems (CPARS), similar systems of other Government departments and agencies, questionnaires tailored to the circumstances of this acquisition, Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) channels, interviews with program managers and contracting officers, and other sources known to the Government, including commercial sources.

Offerors are to note that, in conducting this assessment, the Government reserves the right to use both data provided by the offeror and data obtained from other sources. The Government may consider the offeror's past performance in the aggregate rather than on a contract-by-contract basis.

More recent and relevant performance by the same division/organization will have a greater impact on the Performance Confidence Assessment than less recent or relevant effort. Likewise, a more relevant past performance record may receive a higher confidence rating and be considered more favorably than a less relevant record of favorable performance.

1.6 Factor 4 - Cost/Price Factor

1.6.1 Criteria

The Government will evaluate the offeror's Cost/Price Proposal against the following criteria:

Reasonableness: For a price to be reasonable, it must represent a price to the Government that a prudent person would pay when consideration is given to prices in the market.

1.6.2 Techniques

Price will be evaluated to determine reasonableness of the offerors proposed price. Reasonableness is defined as a price to the Government that a prudent person would pay when consideration is given to prices in the market. Normally, price reasonableness is established through adequate price competition, but may also be determined through price analysis techniques as described in FAR 15.404. The offeror's price proposal will be evaluated in accordance with the following:

Total evaluated price. The total evaluated price will be calculated as the sum of the following:

- For CLIN 0001, the proposed firm fixed price.
- For each Fixed Price Award Fee CLIN including options, the proposed firm fixed price
- For award fee CLINS evaluate at proposed maximum award fee
- For cost reimbursement CLINs including options, the Government estimate.
- For offerors using GFP, \$45,000. (estimated cost of GFP) will be added to the base and each option year for evaluation purposes only

1.6.3 Rejection of Unrealistic Offers

The Government may reject any proposal that is evaluated to be unrealistic in terms of program commitments, including contract terms and conditions, or unrealistically high or low in cost when compared to Government estimates, such that the proposal is deemed to reflect an inherent lack of competence or failure to comprehend the complexity and risks of the program.

1.6.4 Materially Unbalanced Offers

The Government shall analyze proposals to determine whether they are unbalanced with respect to prices or separately priced line items. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total solicitation effort price, the price of one or more contract line items is significantly over or under-stated as demonstrated by the application of price analysis techniques contained in FAR 15.404-1(b), such that:

- a. There is a reasonable doubt that the offer would result in the lowest overall cost to the Government, even though it is the lowest-priced offer, or
- b. The offer is so grossly unbalanced that its acceptance would be tantamount to allowing an advance payment. Unbalanced pricing may increase performance risk and result in a higher proposal risk rating or the offer may be rejected if the Contracting Officer (CO) determines the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government (FAR 15.404-1(g)(3))

The basis of the proposed prices must be compatible with all other elements of the proposal.

1.7 Discussions

The Government reserves the right to award without discussions, thus the offeror should submit their best price upon initial submission of the proposal. If, however, during the evaluation period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions with offerors considered within the competitive range, offeror responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs) and the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) will be considered in making the source selection decision. During Discussions, offerors considered within the competitive range shall be given the opportunity to comment on unacceptable aspects of their proposal (see FAR 15.306(d)), and adverse performance information, except adverse information where they have previously been given an opportunity to respond (e.g. CPARS information). Evaluations of the options shall not obligate the Government to exercise such options.

1.8 Pre-Award Survey

The Government may conduct a pre-award survey (PAS) as part of this source selection. Results of the PAS (if conducted) will be evaluated to determine each offeror's capability to meet the requirements of the solicitation.

M003 SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS, TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as factors or sub-factors to be eligible for award. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the solicitation may result in the offeror being removed from consideration for award. Any exceptions to the solicitation's terms and conditions must be fully explained and justified.
